

### **Remarks**

The Office Action mailed November 3, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-22 are now pending in this application, of which claims 1, 10, and 18 have been amended. Claims 3, 8, 9 and 12 are withdrawn from consideration.

An election of species between Species I, consisting of claims 1-2, 4-7, 10-11, and 13-32 corresponding to Figures 5-13, and Species II, consisting of claims 3, 8-9 and 12 and corresponding to Figures 14-16 was imposed. In response, Applicants confirm the election with traverse to prosecute the invention of Species I, claims 1-2, 4-7, 10-11, and 13-32. Each of the pending independent claims are believed to generic to Species I and II..

The requirement for election is traversed because the inventions set out by the claims in Species I and II are clearly related. Applicants submit that a thorough search and examination of either Species would be relevant to the examination of the other Species and would not be a serious burden on the Examiner. Additionally, requirements for election are not mandatory under 35 U.S.C. 121. Accordingly, reconsideration of the election requirement is requested.

The rejection of claims 1-2, 4-5, 10-11, 13-14, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,232,380) in view of Pelozza (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,998) is respectfully traversed.

Inoue describe a shield cover (20) for an electrical connector. The Office Action cites elements (34) of Inoue et al. as corresponding to the recited secondary shield electrically connected to a cable braid (4). It is clear, however, from Inoue col. 5, lines 23-29 that the cable braid (4) is removed from the portion of the shielding wire (10) which is contained in the portions (34) of the shield cover (20). The elements (34) of Inoue et al. therefore clearly do not satisfy the recited secondary shields as they do not contact the cable braid, and consequently are incapable of providing a low impedance path as claims 1, 10, and 18 now recite.

Pelozza does not cure the deficiencies of Inoue et al. with respect to independent claims 1, 10 and 18. The Office Action cites a portion of Figure 2 adjacent latch elements (38) as

disclosing the recited secondary shield. It is apparent, however, from a closer reading of the Pelozza reference that the portion of Figure 2 adjacent the latch elements (38) are mounting flanges including pivot holes (42) that receive trunnions (46) of a connector cover (44). See Pelozza col. 3, lines 43-47. The mounting flanges are not provided for shielding purposes and have no shielding function. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Pelozza adds nothing to the teaching of Inoue et al. with respect to the instant invention.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that neither Inoue et al. nor Pelozza, considered separately or in combination, describe or suggest the secondary shield of claims 1, 10 and 18, together with the other recitations of the respective claims. Collectively, the Inoue et al. and the Pelozza references fail to teach each element of claims 1, 10 and 18.

Claims 1, 10 and 18 are therefore submitted to be patentable over Inoue et al. in view of Pelozza.

Likewise, dependent claims 2-4, 5, 11, 13-14, and 19-20, when considered in combination with the recitations of their respective base claims, are likewise submitted to be patentable over Inoue et al. in view of Pelozza.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5, 10-11, 13-14, and 18-20 be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. in view of Pelozza and further in view of Aoyama et al. is respectfully traversed.

Claim 17 depends from claim 10, which is submitted to be patentable over Inoue et al. in view of Pelozza for the reasons set forth above. Aoyama et al. is respectfully submitted to add nothing to the teaching of Inoue et al. and Pelozza with respect to the invention of claim 10. Aoyama describes a pressure contact terminal fitting and does not relate to shielding of an electrical connector.

Claim 10 is therefore submitted to be patentable over Inoue et al. in view of Pelozza and further in view of Aoyama et al. When the recitations of claim 17 are considered in combination


with the recitations of claim 10, claim 17 is likewise submitted to be patentable over Inoue et al. in view of Pelosa and further in view of Aoyama et al.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of claims 17 be withdrawn.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 6-7, 15-16, and 21-22. However, it is respectfully submitted that the respective base claims (claims 1, 10 and 18) are patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to claims 6-7, 15-16, and 21-22 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bruce T. Atkins, Reg. No. 43,476  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square  
Suite 2600  
St. Louis, MO 63102-2740  
314-621-5070